

9-29-2000

On Ethical Peacekeeping: Ambivalence and Politics at the United Nations

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp>



Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#), [International Relations Commons](#), [Other International and Area Studies Commons](#), [Other Psychology Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editor (2000) "On Ethical Peacekeeping: Ambivalence and Politics at the United Nations," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*. Vol. 9 : Iss. 11 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol9/iss11/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: On Ethical Peacekeeping: Ambivalence and Politics at the United Nations

Author: Editor

Volume: 9

Issue: 11

Date: 2000-09-29

Keywords: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, United Nations

Abstract. This article highlights the significant interdependence between strategic and ethical concerns in international peacekeeping controlled by the United Nations (UN).

The UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan; the United States (US) President; and many other national leaders have bemoaned the lack of efficacy of UN-run peacekeeping operations. For example, a report commissioned by the Secretary General cited failures in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Sierra Leone (among others) and noted the need for a larger and more professional staff in the UN peacekeeping department and an intelligence gathering capability within the department. It also strongly suggested a lack of commitment to supporting peacekeeping operations among a number of UN members--as to providing personnel, materiel, and money. However, the report's most controversial recommendation is for the UN to jettison the effort to be or to appear neutral in at least those situations wherein one or more of all sides in a killing field seem to be at fault.

It appears that the quest for neutrality denoted as impartiality for adversaries has significant psychological staying power. The associated belief system appears to be that keeping the peace requires equal treatment of adversaries. In fact, the belief system also seems to contain the component that acting any way but equally on the part of the UN serves as a legitimate rationale for one or more sides in a conflict to behave badly.

An appropriate counter to this belief system is that UN behavior should be equitable, not equal. In a bastardization of Marxist theory, one might advocate for each according to expressed behavior as opposed to needs, capabilities, competencies, or intentions. Yet, an appropriate riposte to both equality and equity might be that specific UN acts will inevitably be perceived and interpreted in many different ways. This psychological certainty should not be viewed as an enemy of UN peacekeeping but an epistemological authorization to finally resolve the ethical ambivalence in treating different adversaries who act differently, differently.

A remaining problem in jettisoning the effort to be or appear neutral is a political one. National leaders who thrust forth the construct of sovereignty as a defense against international offense at their offensive behavior seem to fear the loss of the UN effort at neutrality. These leaders may well view the neutrality effort as one that is doomed to failure and, thus, will always serve as a convenient issue with which to attack future UN peacekeeping efforts within their own nation-states and against their own national interests. In this regard, the Secretary General already has made his views well-known by asserting that sovereignty should not always preclude the seeming oxymoron of humanitarian, military intervention. To do otherwise, he contends, would subvert several of the basic goals for which the UN was created.

Thus, both by epistemological and political criteria, the inclination to jettison neutrality as the essence of UN peacekeeping may be a good one. This position can be further underlined by noting that the same can apply to peacemaking, which often is what peacekeeping actually consists of or turns into before and during intervention. (See Liebkind, K., & McAlister, A. L. (2000). Extended contact through peer

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

modelling to promote tolerance in Finland. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 765-780; Mullen, B., Rozell, D., & Johnson, C. (2000). Ethnophaulisms for ethnic immigrant groups: Cognitive representation of 'the minority' and 'the foreigner.' *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 3, 5-24; Neutrality, peacekeeping, and globalization: Problems for the United Nations in Africa. (May, 19, 2000). *IBPP*, 8(17); Peacekeeping with honor. *The New York Times*, p. A30; Schatz, R. T., & Staub, E. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20, 151-174.)(Keywords: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, United Nations.)